

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23 and 25, and have cancelled claims 4-8, 11-12, and 13-28, during the prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims, and to pursue other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13-23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126001).

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1-11, 13-23 and 25-28, and New Claims 29-45

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13-23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126001).

Since claims 4-8, 11, and 13-23, and 25-28 have been cancelled, the rejection of claims 4-8, 11, and 13-23, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1 and 35 are not unpatentable over Northcutt, because Northcutt does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 35.

For example, Northcutt does not teach or suggest the feature:

“receiving a service inquiry from a browser to which a technician is interfaced at a computer comprising the browser, said service inquiry requesting a list of services assigned to the technician for being performed by the technician;

in response to said receiving the service inquiry, formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of service ticketing systems, said service request status message requesting service tickets specifying the services assigned to the technician;

after said sending the service request status message, receiving the service tickets from the service ticketing systems, each service ticket specifying a different service of the services assigned to the technician;

merging the received service tickets into a response list of tickets;

sorting the tickets in the response list by sort parameters to generate multiple sorted ticket request lists; and

storing the multiple sorted ticket request lists in a cache memory at the gateway manager for subsequent display to the technician of a sorted ticket request list of the multiple sorted ticket request lists, wherein the multiple sorted ticket request lists are concurrently stored in the cache memory”.

Applicants note that in claims 1 and 35, the browser sends a service request to ticketing systems, and responsively receives a response list of service tickets from the ticketing systems, wherein each service ticket specifies a different service assigned to a technician for being performed by the technician, and wherein the technician is interfaced to the browser at a computer comprising the browser.

In contrast, Northcutt, Pars. [0011] - [0013] discloses that a user makes a request of service providers for the service providers to perform services for the user.

The user in Northcutt is analogous to the technician in claims 1 and 35 in that the browser on behalf of the technician issues the service request to the ticketing systems, whereas the user in Northcutt issues the service request to the service providers. However, the technician (and not the ticketing system) performs the services in the present invention, whereas the service providers (and not the user) perform the services in Northcutt.

Therefore, claims 1 and 35 are distinguished from Northcutt.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1 and 35 not unpatentable over Northcutt, and that claims 1 and 35 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-3, 9-10, and 29-34 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-3, 9-10, and 29-34 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 36-45 depend from claim 35, Applicants contend that claims 36-45 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM). The Attorney's reference number for this case is END-9501.

Dated: April 5, 2010

/Jack P. Friedman/
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive, Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850 Telephone
(518) 220-1857 Facsimile
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com